

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

REYES CONTRERAS MURCIA, *et al.*,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
CITY OF SANTA MONICA, *et al.*,  
Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-05253-FLA (MARx)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY  
THE COURT SHOULD NOT  
DISMISS ACTION FOR LACK OF  
PROSECUTION**


1 On March 11, 2025, the court entered an Order Denying Plaintiffs' Motion for  
2 Class Certification, Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, and Related  
3 Matters ("Order"). Dkt. 67. The Order set a deadline ("Briefing Deadline") of April  
4 10, 2025, for Plaintiffs Reyes Contreras Murcia and Sherman Perryman ("Plaintiffs")  
5 to file an amended motion for preliminary approval of class action settlement  
6 ("Amended Motion"). *Id.* at 10.

7 Plaintiffs proceeded to file three *ex parte* applications to continue the Briefing  
8 Deadline. Dkts. 68, 70, 72. The court granted the applications for good cause. Dkts.  
9 69, 71, 73. The deadline to file the Amended Motion was May 30, 2025. Dkt. 73.  
10 Plaintiffs have not filed an Amended Motion.

11 Accordingly, the court ORDERS Plaintiffs to show cause ("OSC") in writing,  
12 within fourteen (14) days of this Order, why the court should not dismiss this action  
13 for lack of prosecution. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) (the court may dismiss an action or  
14 claim for failure to prosecute). Failure to respond timely may result in dismissal of  
15 this action without further notice.

16  
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18  
19 Dated: August 18, 2025

20   
21 FERNANDO L. AENLLE-ROCHA  
22 United States District Judge  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28